

REMARKS

This Reply is in response to the Decision of the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, dated November 28, 2007 affirming-in-part the Examiner's final rejection of June 28, 2006.

In the Board's Decision, the Board sustained the Examiner's rejection of claims 10, 14, 27 and 31 as anticipated by de Marcken, but reversed the rejections of claims 1-9, 11-13, 15-26, 28-30 and 32-49 over de Marcken and Ran. The Board in passing also noted that there was no antecedent basis for table in claim 15.¹

In response to the Board's Decision, Applicant has amended claims 10, 12, 13, 19, 27, 29 and 30 to bring the Board's Decision into effect. The Board specifically found dependent claims 11 and 28 (which were dependent on independent claims 10 and 27) allowable over the cited art because each of the claims called for a table.²

Accordingly, Applicant has added the features of claims 11 and 28 into the respective base claims 10 and 27 and has canceled claims 11 and 28.

Applicant notes that claim 11, as presented to the Board called for:

11. The method of claim 10 wherein displaying a summary comprises:
displaying criteria associated with the bins as cells in a table.

Amended claim 10 now recites:

10. (Currently Amended) A method for displaying travel options comprises:
compartmentalizing travel options into bins according to a set of criteria of the travel options; and

¹ Decision page 11.

² Specifically the Board stated:

However, for the reasons previously discussed, we will not sustain the Examiner's rejection of dependent claims 11-13, 15-19, and 28-30 which call for, among other things, a table. Id.

displaying a summary of the travel options in a table rendered
in a graphical user interface according to the bins with the criteria
associated with the bins as cells in the table.

Applicant contends that the amendment to claim 10 fairly represents incorporation of the subject matter of claim 11 into claim 10 and comports with the Board's Decision.

Applicant amended claims 12, 13 and 19 to make the features of those claims limit the displaying element, rather than the compartmentalizing element of the base claims for consistency.

Applicant has amended claim 27 in a similar manner as claim 10, and has amended the remaining claims 29 and 30 to make the features of those claims consistent with claim 27. No new matter has been added.

Applicant notes that amendment to claim 15 is no longer necessary in view of Applicant's amendment to base claim 10.

No fee is due. If a fee is due, please charge that fee and please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

1/29/08

Denis G. Maloney
Reg. No. 29,670

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906